



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

After he had taken so much trouble to discriminate between his source and his own poem, it seems singular that the author should cast aside the discrimination entirely. The line in *Ombre* does not demand the sacrifice.

On the other hand, in favor of Meyer's and Paris' view is the signing of *Ombre* by its author. If Jean Renart wrote *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* he did not concern himself with transmitting that action to posterity. But he does claim *Ombre* and weaves his name into its lines, so that there should be no possibility of the *lai* becoming anonymous. Now the custom among Medieval writers seems to have been to establish a reputation before openly assuming literary responsibility. Their first works would be marketed without any other signature than the one provided by the heading or ending of the manuscript. Whether this custom holds good in the case of Jean Renart or not, it nevertheless occasions surprise to see that his longer and apparently more important poems furnish no hint as to the identity of their composer. We would, therefore, presume that they were earlier than the signed poem. At all events, they were less popular and were known to a smaller circle. The testimony of the manuscripts extant proves the greater vogue of *Ombre*.

Possibly because of the apparent priority of *Escoufle* to *Ombre*, Gaston Paris was led to set the composition of the former poem as far back as 1185. This date seems too early for various reasons. One is that the spirit of *Escoufle* is no longer the spirit of the poems of the eighth and ninth decades of the twelfth century. Its interest in the trials of true love is slight. That interest is subordinated to a desire to portray social customs and the life of the day.¹⁹ Again, the reference to the plot of *Escoufle* in *Guillaume de Dole* would show that only a short interval separated the two poems. Servois dates *Guillaume de Dole* between 1199 and 1201. *Escoufle* must have been written by 1198, because of the complimentary reference to the Countess of Champagne contained in ll. 5614, 5615. This countess could hardly be other than Mary, the patroness of poets, who died in 1198. Besides, *Escoufle* is to be sent to a count of Hainault. Gaston Paris evidently took

this count to be Baldwin V, who became count of Flanders also in 1191. But because of the proximity of *Escoufle* to *Guillaume de Dole* this dedication must be intended for Baldwin VI, who became count in 1195 and who left Hainault, in 1202, for Venice and Constantinople. Therefore, *Escoufle* could be plausibly assigned to the years 1196-1198. *Guillaume de Dole* follows after in 1199-1201 (?). If *Ombre* follows *Guillaume de Dole*, as well as *Escoufle* (it may, of course, come between them), then the development of Jean Renart's poetic talent took place between 1195 and 1205 approximately.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

SIR THOPAS AND SIR GUY. I.

In seeking for parallels to the phraseology of Chaucer's *Sir Thopas*, it is natural to turn first to the romances which Chaucer himself mentions, *Octavian Imperator*,¹ *Perceval*,² *Horn Childe*, *Ypotys*, *Bevis*, *Sir Guy*, *Sir Libeaux*.³ A study of these in the earliest extant English versions gives the following results: to the phraseology of *Sir Perceval*, there is but one parallel in that of

- ¹ Say, felow, who shal hunten here
Quod I: and he answerde ageyn,
Sir, themperour Octovien.

Book of the Duchesse, ll. 366 ff.

This is generally taken as a reference to the romance. See Skeat's *Chaucer*, I, p. 472; Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, N. Y., 1892, 2, 302.

- ² *Sir Thopas*, l. 214 ff. Skeat, iv, 190 ff.

- ³ Men speke of romances of prys,
Of Horn child and of Ypotys,
Of Bevys and Sir Gy,
Of Sir Libeux and Pleyndamour.

Sir Thopas, ll. 186 f.

Of these, the *Ypotys* we have is not a romance in our sense of the word, but a didactic poem with nothing about it to suggest its place in such a list. It is, of course, possible that Chaucer knew something else of the name, but "romance" was an inclusive term in his day (see Skeat's note, v, 198). Chaucer himself applies it to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (*Book of the Duchesse*, ll. 44 ff.); and the translator of Grosseteste's *De Principio Creationis* calls that serious work a romance (Horstmann, *Altengl. Legenden*, N. F., 1881, p. 349). *Pleyndamour*, if a separate romance, has never been identified (cf. Skeat, v, 199).

¹⁹ See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XIII, cols. 345, 346.

Sir Thopas, ten to that of *Octavian*, none to that of *Horn Childe or Ypotys*; quite otherwise is it with *Libeaus Desconus*, *Bevis of Hampton*, and *Guy of Warwick*, where so many correspondences of phrase occur, that, taken together, they make it most probable that Chaucer knew the very English versions accessible to us. In other romances not mentioned by him, are also to be found many parallel phrases. In one of these, *Sir Degrevant*,⁴ there are some lines very suggestive in relation to the phrase, "of popes and of cardinales."⁵ It is to *Guy of Warwick*,⁶ however, that I would direct particular attention, since the number of phrases in it that are parallel to those of *Sir Thopas* far exceed the number of such phrases in any other one romance, and other interesting resemblances are worthy of notice.

That *Guy of Warwick* had a wide circulation is proved by the numerous versions which still exist. From the shadows in which its origins are lost, it first emerges to our eyes in a French version of which eight manuscripts remain.⁷ There exist, in whole or in part, four Middle English translations,⁸ the oldest of which, that in the Auchinleck ms., written early in the fourteenth century, I use as the basis of comparison. The frequent mention of the tale in literature and its persistence in varying form also attest its popularity. Its hero became a national boast. His name is often coupled, as by Chaucer, with that of Sir Bevis, another reputed Englishman of valor.⁹ In *Richard Cœur de Lion*,¹⁰ the romances of Guy and Bevis are associated with those of fifteen other heroes, ancient and mediæval. In *Sir Generides*,¹¹

he is named with Tristram and Bevis, Perceval and Gawain. Langland¹² has a line—

Felyce, hir fayrnesse fel him al to sklaundre—

which seems to allude to a well-known moral drawn from the disdainful beauty of Guy's wife. In the *Mirror of Life*,¹³ translated from Latin into English in the latter half of the fourteenth century occurs this interesting passage :

I warne gow first ate begynnyng,
Y wyle make gow no veyn carpyng
Of dedes of armes, ne of amoure
As doth menstral and jestonres,
That maketh carpyng in many place
Of Octovyan and Isumbrace,
And of many other gestes
Namely when they come to festes ;
Ne of the lyf of Bewys of Hamptone
That was a knygt of gret renone,
Ne of syre Gy of Werewyke
Alle gif it mygte some men lyke.

The popularity, shown by such frequent, casual reference, did not end with Chaucer's generation. This very persistence is in itself a proof of the earlier vogue. Still another proof is the use of Sir Guy's name to attract readers to serious works. Printed among the writings of Richard Rolle is a sermon on the virtues, put into the mouth of Alcuin and addressed to Guy of Warwick.¹⁴ The title *Speculum Gy de Warewyke*¹⁵ was given to a book entirely didactic in nature. The fame of Guy spread from England and France into remoter regions. It is alluded to in the Spanish romance of *Tirante il Blanco*, supposed to have been written not long after 1430.¹⁶ Dugdale says, on the not unimpeachable authority of Rous, that about 1410, the Saracens of Jerusalem showed great hospitality to a certain Lord Beauchamp, because he was descended from the famous Guy of Warwick, whose story they had in their own language.¹⁷

⁴ *Thornton Romances*, ed. Halliwell, London, 1845, pp. 177 ff.

⁵ *Sir Degrevant*, ll. 1818 f., 1829 f., 1842 ff.

⁶ *Romance of Guy of Warwick*, ed. Zupitza, from Auchinleck and Caius mss., E. E. T. S., London, 1883.

⁷ Zupitza, *Romance of Guy of Warwick*, from Camb. ms., E. E. T. S., London, 1875-76, p. v.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ In *Sir Bevis of Hampton* there is an interesting reference to Guy of Warwick, quoted from the romance itself :

Gij a Warwik, ich understonde
Slon3 a dragoun in Norþ-Homberlonde.
Bevis of Hampton, ed. Kölbing, E. E. T. S.,
London, 1885, ll. 2607 f.

¹⁰ Weber, *Metrical Romances*, Edinburgh, 1810, 2. 6659 ff.

¹¹ *Sir Generides*, ll. 13 ff. (ed. Furnivall, for Roxburghe Club, Hertford, 1865).

¹² Langland, *Piers the Plowman*, ed. Skeat (Oxford, 1886), l. PP. b 12. 47, n. p. 181.

¹³ *Speculum Vitae (Englische Studien*, 7, 469), ll. 36 ff.

¹⁴ Richard Rolle of Hampole, *Works*, ed. Horstmann, London, 1895, 2, 24 ff. It is, of course, quite possible that there were other Guys of repute, whose passing fame was absorbed into that of the great Guy.

¹⁵ *Speculum Gy (donis) de Warewyke*, ed. Georgiana Morrell, E. E. T. S., London, 1898.

¹⁶ Warton-Hazlitt, *History of English Poetry*, London, 1871, 2, 144,

¹⁷ Dugdale, *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, London, 1730, I, 374 ff.

One great cause of Guy's English popularity was the appeal his story made not only to the people's reverence for poetry and love of adventure, but to their national pride. A hero of their own race, his greatest deed had been wrought for their deliverance from a foreign foe. Few ordinary folk doubted the substantial truth of the story, or failed to look with credulous reverence upon the relics among them, Guy's gigantic armor and the rib of the dun cow. In the eighteenth century, Dugdale,¹⁸ with delightful simplicity, rebukes all doubters: "Yet those who are more considerate will neither doubt the one nor the other, [existence and deeds] in as much as it hath been so usual with our ancient historians for the encouragement of after-ages unto bold attempts to set forth the exploits of worthy men with the highest encomiums imaginable; and therefore should we for that cause be so conceited as to explode it, all History of those times might as well be vilified."¹⁹

If Guy's story, then, was so well known and so well beloved, it is surely natural that Chaucer, too, should have known it well, and named it among his "romances of prys." When we consider the character of the tale, it need by no means surprise us if he should also think it a fit subject for parody, with its twelve thousand lines of mechanical, jingling verse, full of stock narrative phrases. To discover whether or not he made any special use of it, we must put the romance and the parody side by side. This I shall endeavor to do, taking first the plots of the two tales, if one can use the word *plot* in connection with a fragment like *Sir Thopas*.

The story of *Sir Guy* is briefly as follows: Guy, son of the powerful steward of Earl Rohant, falls desperately in love with Felice, the earl's daughter, for whom he weeps and languishes. Scornful at first, she at last has pity on his distress, and gives him some hope that he may win her by prowess. He at once sets off in search of fame. When he returns with great renown, won

in Normandy, Spain and Germany, he meets only an approving demand for greater achievement. After five years more of as stern a life as hero ever led, full of fierce fights and valiant conquests, he turns once more toward England, performing prodigies on the way. Having, by bravery and cleverness, secured peace for the emperor of Germany, he turns back to answer an appeal of the Emperor of the East for succor against deadly attacks of the Saracens. The frightful struggle is ended only by decided action on the part of Guy, who insults and beheads the Sultan at his own table. The lover's memory of Felice seems to have faded a little during this stirring life, for Guy is on the point of marrying the emperor's daughter, when he remembers, just in time, and swoons at the altar. Again he sets out for England, rescuing lost knights and ladies on his way. When he finally reaches his own country, after an absence of seven years, he can not still go at once to his love. He must first slay a dragon of the most frightful and deadly sort, which is devastating Northumberland. With all these labors and achievements Felice deigns to be satisfied, and marries her hero amid great rejoicing. With the marriage, the second part of the romance opens.

Guy, after fifteen days of bliss, is seized with remorse when he remembers all he has done for love of a woman, and nothing for love of God. In spite of his wife's tears, he sets forth in pilgrim's habit for Jerusalem. In a doubly-fierce battle with a terrible Saracen, he rescues the fifteen sons of an old knight. It is, however, when he returns to England after some years that he meets the crowning opportunity of his life, at the critical moment when the sovereignty of the king and the independence of the people are staked upon a combat with Colbrond, the giant champion of the Danes.²⁰ Led by a dream, the king calls upon the unrecognized pilgrim for help. Here Guy wins his last glorious victory, here, too, he wins his undying place in the heart of his country.

¹⁸ Dugdale, *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, London, 1730, I, 374.

¹⁹ Dugdale assigns Guy's death to 929 A. D., Lydgate, in his redaction of the story, to 927. This is apparently to fit it into the reign of King Athelstan, 925-941.

²⁰ Shakespeare's two references to the tale honor Colbrond as much as Guy:

. . . Colbrand the giant, that same mighty man.

King John, I, 1, 225.

I am not Samson nor Sir Guy, nor Colbrand. . . .

Henry VIII, v, 4, 22.

Nine months later, a saint's death crowns the hermit's holy life, and one thousand and seven angels bear his soul to heaven.

Such a diffuse and extended life-history as Sir Guy's cannot, it is evident, come into close comparison with the story of Chaucer's hero, so rudely interrupted almost at the beginning. In the short recital, no special incidents suggest those in *Sir Guy*, yet in details there are many points of resemblance. We know less of Guy's personal appearance than of Sir Thopas's, but the hair of both is bright yellow.²¹ Both have been educated to hunt and hawk; riding "bi river" is emphasized more than once in *Sir Guy*. It is only the plebeian accomplishments of Sir Thopas which have no counterparts in Sir Guy, about whom there is nothing plebeian. Sir Thopas's first warlike adventure is with a giant of terrible threats.²² Encounters with giants are a commonplace of all mediæval romance, but they are specially prominent in Sir Guy's history. Beside lesser duels, the crowning point of his

²¹ Chaucer emphasizes the nose of his hero:
And I yow telle in good certayn
He hadde a semely nose.

Sir Thopas, ll. 17 f.

There are two curious allusions in Skelton which might suggest perhaps a popular emphasis upon the noses of both heroes:

She calld yow Syr Gy of Gaunt
Nosyd lyke an olifaunt.
Skelton, *Works*, ed. Dyce, London,
1843, i, 122.

and

Your semely snowte doth passe
Hawked as an hawkys beke, lyke Syr Topyas.
Ib., p. 117.

The "of Gaunt" is puzzling if the reference is to our hero. There may have been other Guys. Considering the use of the word "seemly," the Sir Topyas seems surely Chaucer's or could there have been an earlier *Topas*, known to Chaucer but not to us, where the nose was prominent?

²² Warton quotes "an ingenious critic" who says: "It is further to be noted that the Boke of the Giant Olyphant and Chylde Thopas was not a fiction of his own but a story of antique fame and very celebrated in the days of chivalry; so that nothing could better suit the poet's design of discrediting the old romances, than the choice of this venerable legend, for the vehicle of his ridicule upon them." (Warton-Hazlitt, 2, p. 363.) Unfortunately, Warton does not name the critic, and, as Hazlitt observes, no one else seems to know the "story of antique fame."

career is the fight with the giant Colbrond. That Sir Thopas, in politely postponing the combat till he is better armed, precisely reverses the practice of Sir Guy is one of the points of the parody. In his courteous "if I may," he uses a favorite phrase of Guy's. The feast and arming, which Chaucer makes so prominent, have frequent parallels in Sir Guy, but these are too common in romance to be significant. Like Sir Thopas, Guy rides out for adventure through more than one "fair forest" where he meets at least one "wilde best."²³ It is more to the point that in one wood, he is, like Sir Thopas, so affected by the song of the birds that "in gret longing" he loses himself and his way.²⁴ Like Chaucer's hero, he is most attractive to ladies, but indifferent to all but one. Though thirty maidens are enamored of his beauty, he regards only Felice. In all these correspondences, there is none so peculiar to these two romances as to be in itself convincing proof of their close connection, but they are worth noting. In a few incidents of *Sir Thopas*, there is a closer resemblance to some other romance, specially *Bevis of Hampton*, but in no other tale can be found half so many parallels.

There are also some points emphasized in Chaucer's parody which are very prominent in *Guy of Warwick*. One of these is that Guy is constantly riding or about to ride. At first, after he has been wounded, he comes

soft rideing
Upon a mulet ambling,²⁵

but later it is the rescued lady whom he puts upon the "mule amblinde." He is either leaping on his horse without stirrup²⁶ or bestriding his steed. The

²³ Here, of course, the rhyme and association are so natural that there are many examples, cf.

They ryden forth to a wyld forest
Ther was many a wyld best.

Octavian Imperator, ll. 283 f. (Weber, *Met. Rom.*
Edinburgh, 1810; v. 3, p. 245 ff.)

²⁴ *Sir Thopas*, ll. 61 ff. *Guy of Warwick*, ll. 4519 ff.

²⁵ *Guy of Warwick*, 1328 f.

²⁶ That this mounting without stirrup was felt as characteristic of Guy is shown by a speech of the king in the so-called ballad of *Guy and Colbrond*. When he sees the agility of the unknown champion that

Without any stirropp verament
Into the saddle he spront,

other knights, too, are frequently leaping upon horses. When we turn to *Sir Thopas*, we find the hero's steed mentioned seven times in two hundred lines. It is, however, in contrast rather than resemblance to Guy, for he climbs into his saddle, and his horse "gooth an ambel" like Guy's mule.²⁷ The giant threatens to kill his steed, precisely the calamity that overtakes Guy in most of his encounters.

CAROLINE STRONG.

Radcliffe College.

ANTON REISER AND ASMUS SEMPER.

A hundred years makes but little difference in that endlessly interesting human document, the soul of a boy. And so Otto Ernst's *Asmus Sempers Jugendland* and Karl Philipp Moritz' *Anthon Reiser* offer much in common. Both of these stories are autobiographic in tone and each depicts with great minuteness of psychological detail the growth and striving of its hero. The culmination of his inner combat in artistic expression is the aim of each book. The boys are both North Germans. Reiser is a Hannoverian and Semper comes from a miserable cigarmaking suburb of Hamburg. Each is poor and in each the "Bildungsdrang" is all-powerful.

Asmus Semper is a product of the nineteenth century. It is a simple story told with great love and not a little humor and deserves to be better known to the American public thru the medium of a good translation. Asmus is endowed by nature with a wonderful memory, the gift of absolute pitch, a fine sense of form and color, but above all with a good character and an unwavering instinct for the better things of this world. His family, too, is very interesting and its fortunes and little tragedies form

he remarks,

I neuer knew no man that soe cold have done,
but old Sir Guy of Warw[i]cke towne
that curteous knight himselfe.

Percys' Folio MS., ed. Hales and Furnivall,
London, 1868, II, p. 532.

²⁷ *Sir Thopas*, ll. 86, 174.

a very dear and very German background and one that is close to nature's heart. The Sempers are a very naïve set. They love their Goethe, their Schiller and their Grillparzer with a natural estheticism, and even in their darkest days can read *Faust* or sing arias from Mozart. They demand the necessities of life from fate but also its poetry, its light and its adornment. They dream; they are born transcendentalists, and Ludwig Semper, the father, lives as much in the world of might-have-been as any child in a fairy tale. Asmus has more stamina than the rest of the "Semperei" and it is his intellectual vigor which finally is to raise the family to a higher level.

The story is not, however, a "Bildungsroman" after the manner of Wilhelm Meister, nor is there any plot. Like many of Otto Ernst's other works the interest is in the boy nature with a certain emphasis on pedagogy. It presents Asmus always as a boy; he plays as a boy, feels and thinks as a boy, does wrong as a boy and pays penance as sensitive boys do. One never forgets the boy nature, one feels its sacredness and sympathizes with it. And it grows, it takes on new volume, learns with a fierce joy in knowing, and feels the whole thrill of the world without any decadent precocity of mind or body. The story dallies in the by-paths of nature and the effect of each flower, each facet of the world at every turn that Asmus makes, is pictured with frank pleasure. It is especially in a lovely appreciation of nature that the book should appeal to the America of to-day, for the soul of Asmus is in accord with the world soul and he hears, as we are hearing, the call of the great Pan.

It is quite another side that Moritz' book presents. This story which is most undeservedly forgotten by the great mass of the German reading public,¹ had a decided effect on Goethe who spent much time with Moritz in Rome and who admired him greatly. He attests to the influence of *Anthon Reiser* on his own *Wilhelm Meister*. *Anthon Reiser* was published from 1785-90; the first four parts were

¹ See, however, the recent sympathetic account of Moritz in *Z. für d. dt. Unterricht*, Bd. 21, Hefte 9-10.